DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 413 FL 027 851

AUTHOR	Byrnes, Heidi; Kord, Susanne
TITLE	Developing Literacy and Literacy Competence: Challenges for Foreign Language Departments.
PUB DATE	2001-00-00
NOTE	39p.; In: SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues. Issues in Language Program Direction: A Series of Annual Volumes; see FL 027 849.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; *Cooperation; Educational Change; Higher Education; *Language Teachers; *Literature; *Reading Skills; *Second Language Instruction; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Content Area Teaching

ABSTRACT

This chapter provides a dialogue between two teachers that challenges philosophical and practical divisions both inside and outside the academy regarding the development of literacy and literary competence in foreign language departments. It also describes curricular revisions at their institution that address those divisions. One teacher crafts an argument for reform based on the notion that a thorough rethinking of the understanding of the nature of language is required. Rather than continuing to support educational practices that separate language and knowledge, the author proposes that pedagogical approaches must reflect an understanding of language as a humanly constructed meaning-making model of reality. This understanding of language as a social semiotic presumes an integration of language and knowledge that can shape a new understanding of the nature of language and literacy. To illustrate how these concepts play out in the classroom setting, the other teacher outlines a course that achieves a symbiosis of content and language instruction--a course in which students are encouraged to evolve beyond communicative goals to achieve nuanced interpretations of literary texts and, by extension, human experiences. The teachers weave an argument for curricular reform that integrates language and content at all levels of instruction. (Contains 76 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 481 413

Developing Literacy and Literary Competence: Challenges for Foreign Language Departments

Heidi Byrnes and Susanne Kord
Georgetown University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Ketchem

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Locating Our Dialogue

Reflecting the collaborative spirit of the volume, this contribution is co-written by two colleagues. Our remarks continue in a public forum many conversations that have occurred between us in conjunction with a three-year effort in which all teachers of our home department, the faculty and graduate students of the German Department at Georgetown University, revised the entire undergraduate program. Entitled "Developing Multiple Literacies," the project constitutes an ambitious effort to link language acquisition and the development of literacy in a second language within a comprehensively conceived curricular framework that overcomes the split between language courses and content courses (www.georgetown.edu/departments/german/curriculum/curriculum.html); Byrnes 1999 and 2000). Naturally, the teaching of literature became part of this endeavor to re-envision the work of a collegiate foreign language (FL) department.

Our contribution is not a joint article in the customary sense but, with the exception of this introduction and concluding comments, takes the form of a dialogue of alternating voices that retains our respective interests and different knowledge bases and insights. Susanne Kord, as the literature professor, candidly investigates the enabling and disabling assumptions that characterize existing practices in the teaching of literature, particularly those in upper-level classes taught by literature professors. On that basis she proposes options for linking language learning and literature teaching within the context of an upper-level literature course, a German comedy course. The result can be characterized as a language-based pedagogy of literature, or content in general, a central feature of the restructured curriculum in our department. In turn, Heidi Byrnes investigates what insights adult instructed language acquisition (SLA) research has contributed that might translate into pedagogies for enabling students to engage

FL 027 851

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

substantively with literary texts. She concludes that surprisingly little attention has been devoted to this concern given its central role for collegiate FL departments. However, particularly perceptive work can be found within L1 literacy studies and a literacy-oriented pedagogy, especially in the multicultural context of Australian education that supports students' work with texts, oral and written, by using genre as a construct for organizing both curricula and pedagogy (Freedman and Medway 1994a, 1994b; Gee 1998; Halliday 1993; Jones, Gollin, Drury, and Economou 1989; Martin 1985, 1999). Its radical difference lies not merely in its focus on genre as contrasted with sentence-based grammar but in its underlying conceptualization of the relationship of language and knowledge and, by extension, its relationship of language acquisition and the learners' existing L1-based knowledge and their emerging multiple literacies. Such a reconsidered foundation both necessitates and facilitates the creation of an integrated curriculum for collegiate FL programs and necessitates and facilitates different pedagogical approaches for all faculty members in all courses, literature-oriented or not. In our experience it is an intellectual reorientation that is most appropriate for FL education in collegiate cultural and literary studies departments.

Never the Twain Shall Meet: Language, Literature, and Other Great Divides (Kord)[1]

Teachers of literature, particularly those housed in collegiate FL departments, find themselves facing several Great Divides when doing that for which they are supposedly best qualified, teaching literature. Those rifts can be defined by the polar opposites literature versus language, content versus form, literary scholarship versus the teaching of literature. The Great Divide manifests itself institutionally in the traditional rift in most FL departments between "language instructors" versus "literature professors" and the reward structure that privileges the scholarly over the curricular and the pedagogical; pedagogically in the sense that these structures inevitably shape curricula as well as in-class assumptions and behaviors. In scholarship, the literature-language-divide has found frequent expression in fearful comments by literature professionals on the increasingly uncertain status of literature in upper-level FL instruction, accompanied by worries that literature is being replaced with classes that target "communicative" competencies; in rather desperate attempts to reintroduce literature into this curriculum which is perceived as increasingly "foreign" to the FL literary scholar; and in a growing body of scholarship on the teaching of literature in the FL classroom that focuses more on courses

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

than curricula and largely ignores both available scholarship in language acquisition and in literature.

It should come as no surprise, then, that models that attend to both language acquisition and acquisition of literary competence, however defined, are comparatively rare (cf., Haggstrom 1992; Holten 1997; Knutson 1993; Lazar 1993; Moeller and Kunczinam 1993; Murti 1996; Schultz 1996). On the one hand, scholarship on the teaching of literature frequently engages in pursuits that would be considered outdated and methodologically questionable in literary scholarship, concentrating, as it often does, on questions regarding plot and author biography. On the other hand, language acquisition in the literature classroom is not targeted, but implicit: in courses whose content focus is literature (as opposed to courses that target a specific second language (L2) acquisition goal, such as writing, and merely use literature to attain that goal), L2 acquisition is either ignored entirely or indirectly targeted by comprehensible input and unstructured "discussion."

Both approaches essentially perceive student difficulties in approaching the text as cognitive, not linguistic, and both are at grave odds with the conclusions drawn in parts of the SLA literature as to how L2 students read (Bernhardt 1991). If these depictions by teachers of literature are to be taken as accurate accounts for what goes on in their classrooms, we would have to conclude that nobody ever actually *teaches*. The implication is that students' language level automatically improves in a parallel curve to the increasing sophistication of the content or topics of discussion: students are "encouraged" to develop L2 "skills" in connection with their reading (Dykstra-Pruim 1998, p. 106); they "pick up" the language without the instructor "anticipating" this (Blickle 1998, p. 112); teachers are merely "setting the conditions" for student learning (Brumfit 1985, p. 114). Invariably, the assumption—carried over from the "mastery" model of L2 acquisition—is that students must already have a high level of L2 competence before they even can begin to read, an assumption that already seems to indicate that further explicit L2 instruction and learning will not take place in the literature classroom.

What little does take place is very often limited to "passive skills" like comprehension/recognition, vocabulary acquisition, or stylistic text analyses that are not followed up by active application. Quantity is privileged over quality: what matters is how much the student talks, not how. Reading is followed by comprehension questions; plot summaries are followed by cultural or literary history context questions; the content progression from Stage 1 (content questions and stylistic analysis targeting mainly comprehension) to Stage 2 (background knowledge with regard to author, history, culture attempting to provide

the text with a context) is nowhere matched in terms of L2 acquisition, which is usually abandoned at Stage 1. "Knowledge" is defined initially as comprehension, later as recall of facts; interpretive, analytical, and discourse capabilities are not taught. Very frequently, the refusal to integrate linguistic and literary competence in a literature course results in communicative breakdown at the end: as soon as the discussion moves into the abstract or interpretive/analytical domain, students are permitted to revert to L1 and all attempts at L2 exposure, even on the "input" level, are abandoned. Text analysis in the target language is seen as invariably resulting in a lower level of ideation (Littlewood 1986; cf. also the survey conducted by Gray 1995); this fact is not seen as related to the absence of pedagogical interventions that target the development of analytical abilities in the foreign language, but as an inevitable fact of life in the FL literature classroom. Conversely, the many models for literature classes in which cultural, literary, historical context and the development of analytical skills are abandoned in favor of a near-exclusive focus on the students' personal response to the text (for example Benton 1996; Guidry 1991; Koppensteiner 1990; Moffit 1998) can stand as an indication of the extent to which content is edited out of the course to uphold even its meager L2 component, consisting of comprehensible input and discussion—an indication of the level of sophistication that must be sacrificed to *keep* that input comprehensible.

The Teaching of Literature and Language: Critiquing Received Practice (Byrnes)

The previous *mis-en-scène* regarding the teaching of L2 literature points to a number of issues that have burdened the FL profession for quite some time, in its institutional structures, programmatic choices, pedagogies, and even in the nature of its scholarship. While what Kord aptly describes as the Great Divide has all too often been interpreted as being "caused" by an undue research focus and the concomitant undervaluing of teaching on the part of the literature professoriate (James 1997; Response to Dorothy James 1998a and 1998b; Patrikis 1995; but see Byrnes 2001), more foundational divisions are at work. I interpret them as arising from a long-standing tradition in Western thought, of separating language from knowledge, a tradition that has not only affected major philosophical and linguistic approaches to the understanding of language but has pervasively shaped our educational practices, including most specifically our pedagogies.

Though recent developments in the FL field are not generally interpreted in this fashion, I characterize them as permitting a broader

and more open discussion about the relationship of knowledge, language, and culture than has been possible over the last fifty years. These possibilities have long been available in the quieter recesses of scholarly thinking on both sides of another Great Divide, namely the one created and sustained by the Cold War. Until recently, and for very different sociopolitical and ideological reasons, however, they had little access to the center of the public forum of the profession's discourse. Specifically, our current practices rest, to a significant extent, on a normative and essentialist model of knowledge and language, in line with long-standing Western philosophical constructs that have presumed knowledge to be independent of language, pre-existing, "out there" as it were, in an idealized, even God-given metaphysical realm. Such knowledge is "discovered," usually in the form of rules, or as a way to God's Truth in the Logos of the Book, or in God's Second book, the Book of Nature, the project of the sciences. It is not generally understood as humanly constructed through language, where that linguistic semiosis responds to historical and cultural contingencies and intentionalities and becomes the key site for human cognition, affective and rational, even non-linguistic knowledge creation. Instead, beginning with Greek philosophy, language is primarily seen as the act of naming rather than of human meaning-making. It follows that, given the existence of many languages, a particular language system is therefore in its essence arbitrary and unrelated to the very shaping of that knowledge, and is teachable in the form of abstract rules.

In addition to the consequences arising from this kind of culturally independent understanding of language, twentieth century interpretations of the nature of scientific inquiry provided a corroborating heavy overlay of objectivist and value-neutral metaphors for understanding language as a system. This approach was well suited to the aspirations of the emerging field of American linguistics in its attempt to become an accepted player in the American academy and also a worthy recipient of significant funding resources in the post-war era. The high compatibility between such theorizing about language and the long-dominant model of learning, namely behaviorism, is as obvious intellectually as it is advantageous strategically. It helped to establish the unusual influence and staying-power of the kinds of understandings of language and language learning that have arisen in audio-lingualism and subsequently in the growing field of SLA research. That these are historically embedded constructs with enormous consequences in our educational conduct is well exemplified if one surveys the contributions in even one professional journal over close to a hundred years, as was recently done in retrospective articles in the *Modern Language Journal* (Issues 84, 4 [2000] and 85,1 [2001]).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Even so, I believe the contemporary scene allows for a decidedly different viewpoint, namely the possibility of considering language as a culturally embedded form of human meaning-making, of semiosis, in short, of language as a social semiotic. By that I mean taking knowledge to be intricately linked to the language patterns of situated language use, where the use of language is a way of knowing and a way of being that is historical in origin and directly related to social action. In the former communist-held countries such an approach was best explicated by Bakhtin (1981) and Vygotsky (1986); in the West, such an investigation of language has been referred to as "functional" and is prominently associated with the British-Australian linguist Halliday and his followers. It emphasizes a symbiotic relationship between human activity and language in which, as Hasan (1995) puts it, "the very existence of one is the condition for the existence of the other" (p. 184). By investigating key constructs of systemic-functional linguistics, namely context of situation, register, text, and text structure, it is possible to create a conceptual framework that can substantiate this claim.

For example, Halliday (1985) reverses the relationship between notions of language and notions of grammar that prevail in language instructional contexts. Instead of considering language to be "a system of forms, to which meanings are then attached," he considers language to be "a system of meanings, accompanied by forms through which the meanings can be realized" (p. xiv). In particular, two central meanings are addressed by language, namely "(i) to understand the environment (ideational), and (ii) to act on the others in it (interpersonal). Combined with these is a third metafunctional component, the 'textual', which breathes relevance into the other two" (p. xiii).

Dramatically different from the typical structuralist grammar which is a grammar of syntagmatic linearity—as stated, often with roots in logic and philosophy—this is a grammar not of normative rules but of choices and relations, where "the grammatical system as a whole represents the semantic code of a language" and "the context of culture determines the nature of the code" (Halliday 1985, p. xxxii). Thought-provoking even for our concern with adult instructed FL learning is Halliday's statement regarding child language learning: "As a language is manifested through its texts, a culture is manifested through its situations; so by attending to text-in-situation a child construes the code, and by using the code to interpret the text he construes the culture" (1985, p. xxxii).

To sum up, the relationship of language and knowledge that a systemic-functionalist approach to language foregrounds is that ". . . language as *social semiotic praxis* . . . should be seen unequivocally as a *construer* of reality, not just as its *representer* . . . it does not *represen*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

reality; it simply *construes a model* of reality" (Hasan 1999, p. 53). Therefore, while the relationship between language as a system may be considered arbitrary with regard to the species-specific potentialities of the human language-making capacity, the relation between meaning and that level of the language code which Halliday refers to as its lexicogrammar is far from arbitrary but, instead, constitutive. As Hasan (1999) summarizes this issue:

> The social context within which acts of meaning are embedded is an occasion for carrying out some social action, by co-actants in some social relation, placed in some semiotic contact (p. 62, emphases in original).

My historical excursus in no way suggests that the gradual shift in American FL instruction—interestingly enough primarily at the K-12 level—is an instance of the kind of thorough reconsideration of the relationship of language and knowledge that I have begun to sketch out and located particularly with systemic-functional linguistics and a sociocultural Vygotskian approach to knowledge and learning. Quite the contrary. Given the proceduralization of American FL education, particularly through the power of textbooks, various standardized testing practices, and generally insufficient programs for teacher education, that would be expecting too much.

So, what does all of this have to do with language and literature teaching in collegiate foreign language departments? As I contend, quite a bit. True, the profession's changing assumptions and emphases have generally been described in metaphors that are familiar to the field, namely in terms of grammar versus communication, or accuracy versus fluency, thereby suggesting that the old paradigm is intact: any shifting could then be construed in terms of addition—*add* communication to the foundation of grammar, or *add* fluency once students have acquired a certain level of accuracy. Yet, as the insufficiency of an additive approach came to light, we find, on the one side, high-profile professional skirmishes claiming incompatibility between fluency and accuracy while, on the other side, conciliatory voices pleading the case for both. In the end, they generally recommended little more for the attainment of fluent and accurate language use than the well established practices of skill-getting and skill-using of grammatical features, though now through more contextualized communicative activities.

As it turns out, both positions are deeply flawed. The issue is not, and cannot be, the status of grammar in language use: there is no language use without grammar, more precisely, there is no language use without a situationally accurate lexicogrammar, and that means without appropriate language forms. The issue, instead, is understanding

the nature of language as a social semiotic, an understanding that inherently puts meaning-making, ways of understanding the world around us, at the heart of language use and not as an after-thought, and from there proceeds to ensure the development of local-level accuracy. Herein lies the enormous potential for FL education, particularly if we pursue dynamic change in three areas:

- through a reconsideration of curricula, understood not as a loose aggregation of courses (cf., Byrnes 1998), but as carefully conceptualized and planned encompassing frameworks that continually integrate content and language acquisition;
- through reconsideration of the nature of interlanguage development, understood not as an additive progression toward native-like norms, but as working toward a multicompetence that, at the college level, is best described in terms of multiple literacies;
- through a reconsideration of the nature and place of pedagogy, understood not as privatized sets of options "that work" for an individual instructor but as choices that have a public dimension because they manifest underlying assumptions and educational goals expressed within a previously agreed-upon curricular framework.

Language-Based Literature Teaching: Building Bridges (Kord)

To me the preceding issues have been of profound concern for some time, both as a language teacher and as a professional who has a vested interest in the representation of literature. Previous to my department's curricular reform, my classroom experiences were no different from those of most of my colleagues at other institutions; they can be distilled into the following three points:

- Traditional foreign language classes (by which I mean textbook-based four-skills courses aimed at developing language *skills*, e.g., "proficiency") are seen, by most students, as both less interesting than and intellectually inferior-to "content" courses in other disciplines[2] for two reasons: the course emphasis on skills rather than intellectual development or acquisition of concrete knowledge, and the lower student (and instructor) interest in the subject matter of the course, traditionally a disconnected collection of themes haphazardly

fashioned into the course content by virtue of their placement in the textbook;

- Traditional language training does not prepare students for reading and analyzing literature;
- Once these students "graduate" into the content part of the curriculum, very often the literature course, their inadequate language level limits expression of their cognitive and analytical potential. Very often it leads them to "dumb down" the text in their linguistically inadequate analysis to a degree that I find absolutely unacceptable and that I view as a stark contrast both to the complexity of the text and the students' cognitive abilities.

Since my department has made the decision to take up the challenge to redefine its curriculum in terms of a holistic model of language instruction that integrates linguistic and cultural knowledge right from the beginning (Byrnes 1996, p. 256), it has become more feasible for literature faculty teaching in this new context to develop courses that attend adequately to both "content" and "language." The course that I would like to discuss below is an example of how such bridges can be built. It has numerous advantages over the same literature course as I would have taught it only a few years ago:

- The course takes place in a *curricular context* of other courses on the same level that try to achieve a similar symbiosis of content and language instruction. It follows courses that adequately prepare students for the advanced level language and content work they will encounter in my course.
- The course *combines* intellectually challenging *content* (literature, literary and political history, and reception history) *with discourse training* that will enable students to discuss both the texts and the contexts in an intellectually adequate (scholarly) fashion. The language aspects of the course are *deliberately targeted and developed* in all four modalities, rather than left to chance; students are held responsible for both the content and the linguistic aspects of the course in assessment.
- Compared to other literature courses that I have taught, the course offers a broad and varied menu of activities and discourse and assessment practices which deliberately elicit different discourse skills (descriptive, narrative, organizational, performative, and analytical).

- Compared to other literature courses that I have taught, the course is exceedingly student-oriented, rather than teacher-oriented, without relinquishing or modifying the intellectual or "content" goals of the course.

Look Who's Laughing: German Comedies was developed as a fourth-year course in the context of our departmental curricular reform. It concerns itself equally with literary content (texts and historical/social/authorial/cultural contexts) and with academic/literary discourse about the larger philosophical and scholarly context (investigations of different stylistic and literary forms of humor, of different literary genres, of theoretical texts by the authors on the subject, historical development and differentiation of comic genres, and reception history; cf. syllabus, Appendix A). In an instructional approach that is equally concerned with literature and literacy, this content progression would necessitate an exactly parallel progression in the stylistic/linguistic aspects of the course, reinforced by adequate writing assignments. In *Look Who's Laughing,* these assignments progressed from the micro level (a scene analysis) to the macro level (a review of a play performance, which obviously requires not only concrete knowledge of the structure, content, authorial intentions, sociohistorical context, etc., of the original play, but also a considerable expert vocabulary and stylistic repertoire to mimic the stylistic conventions of professional review writing). For the final paper (on the meta-level), in which students were asked to provide a scholarly analysis of one author's complex relationship with comic genre (Lessing's "serious" comedy; Dürrenmatt's "tragicomedy" etc.), they were required to combine their acquired knowledge of texts and contexts with a solid foundation in relevant secondary literature and an ability to adequately employ scholarly conventions as well as language.

It should be readily apparent that instructors who expect students to deliver this level of reflection, and do it in a linguistically and stylistically adequate manner, must be willing to engage in carefully thought out pedagogical interventions over the course of the semester, with the goal of enabling students to acquire the language necessary to perform these tasks and of providing adequate reinforcement. While the themes remain the same as those of a traditional literature course (to wit, Kleist in the context of the Romantic movement; Kleist in the context of the French Revolution; Wilhelm Busch in the context of the Wilhelminian era; Lessing as a religious philosopher; Carl Sternheim and Nietzsche; Carl Sternheim and Expressionism; Dürrenmatt's adaptation of Aristotelian poetology, etc.), language acquisition is no longer limited to unstructured "discussion." The linguistic tools to discuss

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

topics of this nature have to be deliberately and repeatedly offered to students (see Appendices B and C for examples, one from the beginning and one from the end of the course), in the form of extensive modeling by the instructor, directed discussion on the part of the students, and follow-up assignments (such as oral reports, see Appendix D for the relevant instruction sheet) and written assignments. Needless to say, students' success in acquiring the necessary vocabulary, style, and conventions was central to my assessment of all their work, written as well as oral. Throughout instruction I relied on instructor modeling (in the form of very deliberate usage on my own part of the language I wished students to acquire in the classroom, a model oral report delivered by me, as well as extensive written instructions for all tasks required of the students), repeated exposure, and deliberate stylistic direction of student discussion rather than memorization. Stylistic and lexical tools thus modeled and gradually incorporated into students' speech ranged from basic analytic vocabulary (how to discuss, describe, and analyze a text) to specific vocabulary dealing with theater and performance and finally to the adaptation of scholarly style (how to advance an argument or disprove, support, undermine or critique someone else's; how to write a professional review or place one's own work in the context of scholarly literature).

I would like to offer, at this point, two brief examples of student writing, both on the same theme: a review of the Emil Jannings' 1929 film of Kleist's *The Broken Jug*. The students are charged with incorporating both textual and contextual knowledge of the original drama and language and style adequate to literary analysis and professional review writing (my translation, all mistakes approximated):

> *Student A:* The film speaks much about this */case error/* problem between the */case error/* peasants and the [case error] autorities */spelling error/*. The */case error/* historical background, when *The Broken Jug* was written, explains this theme. The French [error: adjective instead of noun] had sudenly */spelling/* their Revolution (1789) and ten years later came the French ocupation */spelling/* in Germany (with Napolean */spelling/* as Emperor). The German people were */number error/* of course not pleased on this */error: preposition/* and out of this feeling came *The Broken Jug*. A fitting */ending error/* theme here is whether one should respect the authorities. Ruprecht did not do this, and for that he got his punishment.[3]

> *Student B:* The performance of this comedy, authored */case error/* by Heinrich von Kleist, supposedly centers on the theme of injustice in society. Although differences between the written */ending error/* and the performing */participle and ending error/* comedies exist, the plot

> of the comedy remains similar in both. The cultural background of the drama describes a Dutch village near Utrecht during the seventeenth century. At the center of the comedy Kleist places the role of a corrupt village judge. The plot of the film unfolds as follows: In the first scene, Village Judge Adam is portrayed as a corrupt and immoral person. Subsequently, an incident is brought before him. Frau Marthe, a funny old woman, accuses Ruprecht of having */tense error/* broken her jug. This notwithstanding, Ruprecht, who is engaged to her daughter, claims that it was impossible for him to have broken the jug since he had not even been in Eve's room.[4]

In comparing these two writing samples, I would like to argue that while Student B clearly approaches the text with a considerably greater degree of sophistication, that sophistication is *almost exclusively linguistic, rather than cognitive.* In traditional literature classrooms, teachers would be inclined to interpret the difference between these two essays rather vaguely, indeed, fatalistically (Student B is simply a "better" student), as a difference in cognitive and interpretive ability or background "knowledge." In this case, however, both students acquired the same textual and contextual background. The differences in interpretive and analytical ability that these essays obviously reflect are inextricably bound up with the authors' (in)capacity to engage a language that would enable them to express their ideas on the high cognitive level on which they are situated. That level is rather high in Student A's essay: he accurately identifies several central background motives that are essential to an understanding of the play, for example the connection between the French Revolution and the philosophical and social debates it engendered on such principal organizational aspects of society as obedience to authority, as well as the changed aspect this debate must have taken on in Germany where it occurred in the context of occupation from without rather than revolution from within. The problem with Student A's essay is obviously neither historical background nor his ability to apply it to the text nor his level of reflection, but simply the fact that he is linguistically limited. His syntax, sentence structure, morphology, and lexical choices are limited to that intermediate level with which language teachers are so painfully familiar; his menu of verbs at times is limited to introductory material (the French *had* their Revolution; the occupation *came*; out of this feeling *came* the play, etc.). What that means is that it is impossible for this student, *despite the high cognitive ability* he clearly brings to his essay, either to structure his essay in a way that expresses a logical progression from introduction to argument to conclusion, or to express adequately the complex relationships between text, authorial intention,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

social and political context, and decipherable philosophical content. Student B, on the other hand, does all this rather successfully: he progresses smoothly from the introduction to the contrast between film and play to the historical background to a discussion of the film in which plot is intertwined with interpretation to his final (rather critical) assessment of the film vis-à-vis Kleist's original. His deliberate choice of discourse markers (supposedly, subsequently, notwithstanding) both structure the essay and pre-figure its student-author's critical and analytic stance: the "supposedly" in the first sentence, for example, skillfully announces the author's intention to review the film negatively in the final analysis, namely as having failed in its design to portray the theme of social injustice. In contrast to Student A, Student B relies rather heavily on linguistic structures and lexical items acquired in class (compare Student B's "The plot of the film *unfolds as follows*" with Student A's "The film *speaks much about* . . ."). He is producing complex syntax, with significant variation in occurrence and placement of different clause structures within a sentence. And finally, given the fact that most of us have been trained according to the "mastery" model which essentially assumes that error-free L2 production constitutes the desirable outcome, it is important to note that Student B's essay *is not error-free*, that it is, in fact, prone to very similar case, ending, and tense errors as the work of Student A.

My approach throughout the class was neither to insist on error-free language production, as a traditional language instructor might, nor to ignore language entirely, as a traditional literature instructor might, but rather to encourage a stylistic sophistication that eventually enables students to express the whole range of creativity and cognitive reasoning of which they are capable. In the context of their new-found stylistic elegance, scholarly analysis, and sophisticated reasoning, their errors seem a relatively minor concern so long as they impair neither understanding nor students' ability to sustain a sophisticated argument. The applicability of this work to a real-life as well as an academic context seems to support such an approach. While both students commit errors, Student B's opinions and interpretation of the play would be respected in the L1 context—in casual conversation with educated Germans as well as at a German university—; Student A's would not.

In addition to the more traditional writing assignments, which were performed and assessed individually, students were asked to engage in extensive group work either on oral reports or dramatic scripts of their own. Oral reports on each author we read were delivered in groups of two. These reports served a dual function: on the one hand, they moved the class focus from teacher to students (since this

material, now presented as the result of student research, would traditionally have been delivered in the form of a lecture by the teacher); on the other, they constituted extensive oral practice in advanced discourse since they required students to work without notes, from an overhead that was composed in outline form only, and fill these content points with language which was both spontaneous and highly complex (see Appendices D and E for my instructions for the oral reports and an excerpt from a student-produced overhead). Somewhat less traditional, and also less restrictive of students' language use, were the script-writing exercises that completed discussion of each play (see Appendix F for instructions). In these script-writing exercises, students were asked, in groups of four or five, to write and perform a ten-minute version of the play we had just finished discussing while keeping all major plot strands and applying an L1 cultural context of their choice to the play. The results certainly far transcended the benefits traditionally accorded dramatic performances in the L2 classroom (cf., Ronke 1993, pp. 213–17, whose survey respondents listed as primary benefits gains in pronunciation and student confidence). For one thing, my students took the opportunity to incorporate relevant L1 culture as a chance both to be the "expert" (since I was considerably less familiar with these contexts than they were) and to illustrate aspects of the L2 literature through that context. In our bi-monthly in-class performances, Lessing's *Minna von Barnhelm* was revised as a 007-movie, Kleist's *The Broken Jug* as an American courtroom-drama modeled on the O. J. Simpson-trial, Carl Sternheim met Ace Ventura, and Dürrenmatt's *The Visit* metamorphosed into a jailhouse flick. These performances not only resulted in a considerable amount of creative energy and an increased tendency of students to rely on others in the group, they also furnished the basis for a great deal of self-reflexive discussion, centered around the question of what each team had to cut from the original to keep within the ten-minute limit and their reasons (interpretive, analytic, pragmatic, organizational) for making those choices. These performances also required, once again, both linguistic aptitude and a great deal of interpretive acumen. For example, Appendix G provides a short excerpt from one such student production: from within the adaptation of Lessing's original as a 007-movie, simultaneously a skillful parody of the genre itself, emerges a highly perceptive interpretation of the characters and their inter-relationships that is essential to an understanding of Lessing's original (Tellheim's humiliation as a disbanded officer, his generosity apparent in his treatment of the widow, Just's coarseness, his hatred of the innkeeper and his protectiveness of his master). Simultaneously, the exercise provided students with an opportunity to explore facets of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

language otherwise rarely encountered in German language courses (in this case, code language) and to *use language* to create their own aspects of the comic, at times in surprising and innovative ways. Throughout the semester, language from elsewhere in the course was frequently incorporated into student scripts: an example is one production in which the scholarly meta-discourse *about* literature we had practiced in other contexts inserted itself into the lovers' quarrel in the production. I take these scenes, in which Kleist's Judge Adam, played by one of my students, speaks of his own "relativized justice," in which Lessing's Minna, in the best scholarly style, demonstrates Tellheim's opinions to be "riddled with inconsistencies," to be signs that my students were quite willing to explore this new language in both the pragmatic and the playful sense—both aspects that I would consider essential in the pursuit of language acquisition.

Linking Content and Language in Pedagogy: Exploring New Foundations (Byrnes)

To situate the kind of bridge-building that Kord has exemplified with her language-based pedagogy for literature even more explicitly, I return to exploring the three areas I had earlier identified as particularly suitable for linking literature teaching and insights regarding language acquisition. To understand the merits of Kord's example, it is important to point both to the curricular context in which she has created her innovative pedagogy of the teaching of literature and the nature of that practice in light of the possibilities created by that context. Such a deeper understanding is also necessary if her proposals are to be available for wider application in other settings. The guiding concepts I will use for that discussion are the nature of an integrated curriculum, interlanguage development toward multiple literacies, and a public pedagogy of choices within a curricular framework.

Establishing Curricular Foundations for the Teaching of Literature

The German Department's curriculum renewal effort, "Developing Multiple Literacies," is a comprehensive project that spans all aspects of the four-year undergraduate program. It takes a content-oriented and task-based approach in all courses. This means that it focuses on content from the beginning of the instructional sequence and explicitly focuses on acquiring German to academic levels of performance to the end of the instructional sequence at students' graduation. As it does away with the traditional dichotomy of language courses and

content courses, it creates an integrated program which is expressed in terms of five instructional levels according to specific curricular goals.

The entire curriculum is divided into the sequenced courses of Levels I–III, so called because students must take them in sequence. A group of six courses follows at Level IV. Addressing different content areas, they nevertheless share similar acquisitional goals and pedagogical emphases. At least two of these courses (for majors one of these is *Text in Context*) are taken by anyone wishing to pursue further studies in the department. Finally, Level V offers an open-ended number of courses. Such courses reflect broad student and faculty content and research interests. They continue the explicit linking of content with acquisitional concerns within a genre-based pedagogy, an approach that is particularly well suited to exemplifying and negotiating issues of learner identity and voice as these define upper levels of ability in a second language.

Beginning with thematically clustered content areas that exemplify a range of textual genres and that are manifested in the actual texts chosen—and these, of course, include literary texts—the curriculum as a whole, and each course in turn, derives from these materials a variety of carefully sequenced pedagogical interventions. With the exception of Level I, all instructional materials for the central required courses were created by the faculty–graduate student teams. Though Level I uses a commercially produced textbook, actual instruction is refocused by the extensive incorporation of materials and pedagogical tasks that not only respond to the acquisitional goals of this level but in important ways lay the foundation for and anticipate the practices at the subsequent levels, particularly their basic discourse orientation.

A close link between theme, genre, text, and task provides the basis for the pedagogical and real-world tasks in which students engage at all levels in all courses (cf., Grabe and Stoller 1997; Long and Crookes 1993; Robinson 2001; Skehan 1998; Stoller and Grabe 1997). This approach, not a method in the traditional sense, is intended to enhance learners' attentiveness to meaning-form relationships as they characterize a particular topic or field of inquiry (Long and Robinson 1998). Students' actual engagement with the materials incorporates considerations of task complexity, task difficulty, and task performance conditions as psycholinguistically important notions pertaining to the nature of learner processing and, by implication, the nature of students' likely performance (Skehan 1998). By conceptualizing L2 development as a long-term process within a coherent four-year program that is designed to facilitate students' evolving accuracy, fluency, and complexity of language use in all modalities, the curriculum strives for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

continued efficient and effective interlanguage development toward advanced levels of competence, including those that we associate with literate language use, and quite specifically, the interpretive abilities that we consider to be at the heart of work with literary texts.

From the particulars of our experience with curriculum renewal, the following generalizations for relating literature and language learning in programs and pedagogies have arisen:

- the priority of content in instruction, a priority which, importantly, is established through and with an in-depth exploration of the language of texts *so that both content and language might be learned together;*
- an exploration of texts from two perspectives, as embodying the typified features of the genre they represent, and as showing particular, situated forms of social action which are made possible by and within the overall capacaties of the genre;
- an emphasis on deliberately relating changes in the classroom to the best knowledge in the field as we could discern it, but always referring back to our particular educational setting and teaching situation and to the kind of language learning it seemed to facilitate;
- a willingness to consider this an open process, as manifested in the many informal and formal occasions for reflective teaching practice with their recursive loops and iterative adjustments—from textual to curricular to pedagogical to assessment insights and back.

All four areas show that curriculum, our students' interlanguage development, and our pedagogies are intimately related to each other and can be evaluated and developed only within that nexus. Previous efforts to link literature and language acquisition have tended to treat these matters separately: they focused on individual courses, made diverse recommendations about materials, suggested successful pedagogies, and considered their students' language learning characteristics. By contrast, this genre-based approach focuses on all these aspects simultaneously and locates them within the framework of a curriculum that has been conceptualized in terms of the specific functional literacies that learners can be expected to attain at each sequenced instructional level. All educational decisions are negotiated within this nexus.

Rethinking Interlanguage Development toward Multiple Literacies

The notion of interlanguage—the learner's gradual and non-linear approximation of target language norms—is perhaps the most central concept in recent SLA research, both classroom-based and naturalistic. Given its appearance in the early 1970s, it has, by and large, been interpreted in psycholinguistic processing terms that retain strong traces of the separatist status of language and knowledge that is part of the discipline's heritage. However, more recently, directions are opening up in theoretical and empirical linguistic research that investigate the perennial question between linguistic determinism and linguistic relativism in language use and language acquisition. When they come from a cognitive semantics perspective they interpret interlanguage development not only as linking cognition and language use but also as relating to societal practices, particularly to generic textual practices (see particularly the articles in the edited volumes by Gumperz and Levinson, 1996; Tomasello 2000; also Slobin 1996a, 1996b, 1997, 1998; Talmy 2000). Recently this conceptualization has begun to be influenced by emerging notions of literacy in education, particularly from a sociocultural perspective (cf., Gee 1998; Miller 1984; Wells 1994, 2000; Wertsch 2000). The result is an understanding of interlanguage development that is reminiscent of a kind of cognitive apprenticeship, a description that fits the adult L2 classroom particularly well when its pedagogy is genre-based (Kern 2000).

Genre-based forms of literacy are taken to instantiate larger sociocultural patterns according to which we take knowledge from the environment (Heath 1982; Tannen 1982, 1992). That does not mean that education will not or may not target specific literacies, such as the essayist academic discourse, the discourse of literary texts, or the discourse of talking about literary texts, as specific learning goals. Indeed, such literacies would not be presumed to arise naturally for all learners but would need to be taught explicitly (Gee 1998; Kinsella 1997; Martin 1998; Mohan 1979, 1986, 1989), and they would be placed in the context of larger communicative practices in order to signal that different groups employ and prefer different semiotic strategies in their literacies. As Gee (1998) and also the New London Group (1996) note, when they refer to the exclusionary as well as empowering nature of privileged forms of discourse, such sophisticated levels of awareness into discursive behavior are no longer a luxury but are necessary in a global, multilingual, and multicultural environment because they prepare individuals and groups to create new designs for sociocultural action in different spheres of their lives. Ultimately

through such reflection, students have the possibility for a deeper appreciation of the nature of all human meaning-making as heteroglossic and multilingual, for the individual and for a whole society (Bakhtin 1981), with all that this implies.

One of the few treatments of these matters explicitly intended for the L2 classroom is that by Kern (1995, 2000), who integrates the relevant literature into his notion of an "active literacy." His choice of term is itself a good reminder of the extent to which static notions of language and of language learning—which are focused on the individual outside any social frame of reference—continue to dominate thinking in the L2 teaching profession. Instead, he recommends that:

> Literacy needs to be developed through multiple experiences, in multiple contexts, with multiple text genres (both oral and written), for multiple purposes. Moreover, attention must be paid to the *relationship* among the particular text types, particular purposes, and particular ways of reading and writing in a given literacy practice. Finally . . . we need to encourage students to take an active, critical stance to the discourse conventions we teach them (1995, p. 67).

In our experience with such a teaching toward multiple literacies the following features stand out:

- the centrality of text and its intended meaning(s) via genres, as the most suitable unit of analysis, not the word as in most of Vygotsky's account, nor the sentence as a traditional formalist approach strongly suggests;
- the nature of meaning-making occurring in the form of "constructing and interpreting of texts, and this involves the interplay of different components of meaning—interpersonal, textual, and logical, as well as experiential" (Wells 1994, p. 70);
- a greater transparency between grammar and lexicon at all levels of instruction and in all our pedagogical efforts and a greater focus on their resource rather than their rules character or their idiosyncratic nature;
- a careful integration of the linguistic characteristics of both dynamic and synoptic textual genres and their linkage to different genres and registers;
- the need to provide guidance to students as they engage in the important restructuring of their language system to accommodate the more abstract and systemic meanings encountered in written texts, something that is likely to occupy

them as well in their expanding L1 literacy, albeit at a more elaborated level.[5]

Toward a Public Pedagogy of Choices

Excellent teaching has always in the past depended on and will always in the future depend on teachers who are able to make their own informed choices involving awareness, attitude, knowledge, and skills. For us, the significant added benefit of the curricular renewal was that it created a forum for shaping and informing individual notions about second language learning by adults *in terms of certain basic premises we had agreed upon as an entire department*. Once that agreement existed, the curriculum itself, as process and product, developed into a flexible system of teacher beliefs, "the information, attitudes, values, theories, and assumptions about teaching and learning that teachers build up over time and bring with them to the classroom" (Richards 1994, p. 385). In addition to constant informal contacts, this kind of shared "pedagogical reasoning" came about, among other events, through whole group workshops, through level-specific considerations of materials, pedagogies, and assessment issues, through mutual class visitations and semester-long mentored teaching, through the creation of central documents that summarized our beliefs and spelled out their implications for our practice, and through pedagogical materials sharing, the results of which are now available on a joint computer drive accessible to all teaching staff.

In other words, in contrast to the pervasive practice in higher education of privatizing teaching, our program as a whole and our individual teaching became public goods to and for ourselves, rather than private possessions. In a sense, our collaborative work became our joint learning and the real foundation for departmental knowing, gradually leading us away from notions of "rightness" and "wrongness" about adult foreign language learning, from the sacred sites of the professional discussion—grammar, accuracy, fluency, content knowledge—and from pedagogical interventions as codified and approved by "methods." In particular, we continue to develop more sophisticated levels of awareness of the relationship between genres, themes, texts, and tasks as we explore in greater depth those aspects of L2 learning that characterize the very advanced learner at our curricular Level V.

Exploring Implications and Applications

How might the considerations that have arisen in our curricular implementation play themselves out as we reflect on future opportunities and challenges posed by an integrated content-oriented and task-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

based curriculum that gives a prime role to discursive practices mediated by genres? On a microlevel, activities of particular promise are that we should:

- investigate even more closely the relationship between genres and language use (see Martin 1998), connecting genres more overtly to task (Swales 1990), emphasizing their cultural embeddedness (Paltridge 1995), and explicitly submitting them to crosscultural comparisons (Kern 2000);
- explore the relationship between knowledge structures, genres, and text structures by strategically employing the procedural approach to transferring comprehended text into produced text that characterizes Swaffar, Arens, and Byrnes' (1991) treatment of reading;
- foster a more explicitly language-based approach to reading that goes beyond the customary schema-theoretic approach and follows Kintsch's (1989) proposal for what he calls a *construction-integration* model which deliberately links meaning creation to appropriate attention to language from a textual perspective;
- extend our linkage of textual analysis, particularly the organization of texts according to larger discourse units, to the teaching of writing and speaking, potentially including some aspects of this work already in Level III courses;
- use assessment practices to reinforce and expand our awareness of the interaction of content, texts, and tasks. Our most recent change-over to task-based writing assessment practices in all sequenced courses is now being extended to the assessment of speaking in those courses (Byrnes in press).

On a macrolevel, our experiences challenge both the dominant assumptions of FL teaching and also those regarding the nature and role of literature in a FL department. On the one hand, such approaches see language learning as learning to mean and not so much as the application of rules within the confines of the grammatical sentence. On the other hand, they locate students' engagement with L2 literary texts within the broader context of a socioculturally constituted literacy, where the appreciation and interpretation of literary texts is a highly specialized and valued skill, but by no means the only way in which students engage with texts in the process of acquiring the second language.

Indeed, one way to summarize both aspects would be to conclude that the notion of L2 literacy or, more precisely, multiple literacies in L1 and L2, constitutes a particularly felicitous way of characterizing

the entire enterprise of learning a foreign language in a college environment because texts and their imagined worlds, rather than the contexts of the "real" world, constitute the vast majority of language use in our classrooms. An elaborated ability to work with texts—in comprehension and production, orally and in writing—is not merely a precondition for substantial work with literary texts. It aptly describes all second language learning by collegiate foreign language learners, regardless of programmatic emphasis or individual student interest and regardless of the level of instruction. Because a sophisticated literacy is essential for attaining advanced levels of performance, the construct of genre and the pedagogical approach arising from it support the integration of all undergraduate FL instruction that has heretofore eluded FL departments. Even if students are unable to invest the necessary time to attain such performance abilities we, as teachers, will have done everything while these students were in our classrooms so that their language use *at a time* would lead to continued and balanced language development toward multiple literacies *over time*.

Notes

1. I would like to thank my thirteen comedians for all they've taught me about teaching, for their hard work and for their willingness to let me use some of it here: Hanne Wegner, Cy Griswold, Dan Oldroyd, Ivan Parkinson, Fred Waelter III, Vivien Dude, Jeremy Higginbotham, Suzanne Johnson, Pat Hanniford, Michelle Corona, Ryo Hasegawa, Frank Salamone, and Kirsten Schwarz.

2. That there is an implicit hierarchy between "language courses" and "content courses," between courses perceived as teaching skills and those perceived as addressing intellectual development, is undeniable and manifests itself in countless aspects of daily university life: the widespread perception among language teachers that students, as a rule, tend to take language or skills courses less seriously than other courses; the pervasive attitude among literature professors who frequently consider language teaching at the beginning and intermediate level as beneath them; the lower status of "language teachers" compared with "literature" (or other "content") professors within the profession. The Georgetown German Department curriculum, initially designed to address the divide between skills and content teaching, has also had a significant effect on some of these ancillary issues in our department. the hierarchies dividing "language teachers" and "literature professors" have of necessity disappeared along with the divide between language and content courses.

3. *Student A:* Der Film spricht viel über diesem Problem zwischen die Bauern und die Obrichkeit. Die historische Hintergrund, als *Der zerbrochne Krug* geschrieben wurde, erklärt dieses Thema. Die Französische hatten

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

plotzlich ihre Revolution (1789) und zehn Jahre später kam die französische Okupation in Deutschland (mit Napolean als Kaiser). Das deutsche Volk waren natürlich nicht froh darauf und aus diesem Gefühl kam *Der zerbrochne Krug*. Ein passende Thema hier ist, ob man die Obrigkeit respektieren sollte. Das hat Ruprecht nicht gemacht, und dafür hat er eine Strafe bekommen.

4. *Student B:* Die Aufführung der von Heinrich von Kleist geschriebene Komödie soll sich prinzipiell mit dem Thema Unrecht in der Gesellschaft befassen. Obwohl Unterschiede zwischen den geschriebene und aufgeführene Komödien existieren, bleibt die Handlung der Komödie in den beiden ähnlich. Der kulturelle Hintergrund des Dramas beschreibt ein niederländisches Dorf bei Utrecht während des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts. In den Mittelpunkt dieser Komödie stellt Kleist die Rolle eines korrupten Dorfrichters. Die Handlung des Films entwickelt sich wie folgt. In der ersten Szene wird der Dorfrichter Adam als ein korrupter und unmoralischer Mensch dargestellt. Mithin wird ein Vorfall vor sein Gericht gebracht. Frau Marthe, eine komische alte Frau, klagt an, dass Ruprecht ihren Krug zerbrochen hatte. Demungeachtet behauptet Ruprecht, der mit ihrer Tochter verlobt ist, dass es unmöglich wäre, dass er den Krug zerschlagen hätte, weil er überhaupt nicht in Eves Zimmer gewesen sei.
5. Our Level IV required course, *Text and Context*, particularly targets this threshold and regularly finds students acknowledging that this is a level of language use that they do not necessarily control well in English.
6. NB: Bitte NICHT "der Abtritt" (= antiquiertes Wort für Toilette!)

Works Cited

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*, edited by Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Benton, Michael. 1996. The Discipline of Literary Response: Approaches to Poetry with L2 Students. In *Challenges of Literary Texts in the Foreign Language Classroom*, edited by Lothar Bredella and Werner Delanoy, 30–44. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Bernhardt, Elizabeth B. 1991. *Reading Development in a Second Language*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Blickle, Peter. 1998. Teaching the Concept of Childhood and Nineteenth-Century German Children's Books in an Intermediate German Course. *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 31: 110–15.

Brumfit, Christopher J. 1985. *Language and Literature Teaching From Practice to Principle*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Byrnes, Heidi. 1996. The Future of German in American Education: A Summary Report. *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 29: 253–61.

_____. 1998. Constructing Curricula in Collegiate Foreign Language Departments. In *Learning Foreign and Second Languages: Perspectives in Research and Scholarship,* edited by Heidi Byrnes, 262–95. New York: MLA.

_____. 1999. Meaning and Form in Classroom-Based SLA Research: Reflections from a College Foreign Language Perspective. In *Meaning and Form: Multiple Perspectives,* edited by James F. Lee and Albert Valdman, 125–79. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

_____. 2000. Languages Across the Curriculum—Intradepartmental Curriculum Construction: Issues and Options. In *Languages Across the Curriculum: Interdisciplinary Structures and Internationalized Education,* edited by Maria Regina Kecht and Katharina von Hammerstein, 151–75. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

_____. 2001. Reconsidering Graduate Students' Education as Teachers: It Takes a Department! *Modern Language Journal* 85(4).

_____. in press. The Role of Task and Task-based Assessment in a Content-Oriented Collegiate FL Curriculum. *Language Testing* 19(2).

Christie, Frances. 1999. Genre Theory and ESL Teaching: A Systemic Functional Perspective. *TESOL Quarterly* 33: 759–63.

Dykstra-Pruim, Pennylyn. 1998. Independent Reading for Beginners: Using Children's Books in a Reading Lab. *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 31: 101–109.

Freedman, Aviva, and Peter Medway, eds. 1994a. *Genre and the New Rhetoric.* London: Taylor & Francis.

_____. 1994b. *Learning and Teaching Genre.* Westport, CT: Heinemann.

Gee, James Paul. 1998. What is Literacy? In *Negotiating Academic Literacies: Teaching and Learning across Languages and Cultures,* edited by Vivian Zamel and Ruth Spack, 51–59. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Grabe, William, and Fredricka L. Stoller. 1997. Content-Based Instruction: Research Foundations. In *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content,* edited by Marguerite Ann Snow and Donna M. Brinton, 5–21. White Plains: Longman.

Gray, Richard T. 1995. Part One: Materials. In *Approaches to Teaching Kafka's Short Fiction,* edited by Richard T. Gray, 3–18. New York: MLA.

Guidry, Glenn A. 1991. Teaching Critical Response with Goethe's *Werther. Die Unterrichtspraxis* 24: 156–63.

Gumperz, John J., and Stephen C. Levinson, eds. 1996. *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haggstrom, Margaret A. 1992. A Performative Approach to the Study of Theater: Bridging the Gap Between Language and Literature Courses. *French Review* 66: 7–19.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

_____. 1993. Towards a Language-Based Theory of Learning. *Linguistics and Education* 5: 93–116.

Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1995. The Conception of Context in Text. In *Discourse in Society: Systemic Functional Perspectives: Meaning and Choice in Language: Studies for Michael Halliday*, edited by Peter H. Fries and Michael Gregory, 183-283. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

_____. 1999. The Disempowerment Game: Bourdieu and Language in Literacy. *Linguistics and Education* 10: 25–87.

Heath, Shirley Brice. 1982. What No Bedtime Story Means: Narrative Skills at Home and at School. *Language in Society* 11: 49–76.

Holten, Christine. 1997. Literature: A Quintessential Content. In *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content*, edited by Marguerite A. Snow and Donna M. Brinton, 377–88. White Plains, NY: Longman.

James, Dorothy. 1997. Bypassing the Traditional Leadership: Who's Minding the Store? *ADFL Bulletin* 28(3): 5–11.

Jones, Janet, Sandra Gollin, Helen Drury, and Dorothy Economou. 1989. Systemic-Functional Linguistics and its Application to the TESOL Curriculum. In *Language Development: Learning Language, Learning Culture*, edited by Ruqaiya Hasan and James R. Martin, 257–328. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kern, Richard. 1995. Redefining the Boundaries of Foreign Language Literacy. In *Redefining the Boundaries of Language Study*, edited by Claire Kramsch, 61–98. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

_____. 2000. *Literacy and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kinsella, Kate. 1997. Moving from Comprehensible Input to "Learning to Learn" in Content-Based Instruction. In *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content*, edited by Marguerite Ann Snow and Donna M. Brinton, 46–68. New York: Longman.

Kintsch, Walter. 1989. Learning from Text. In *Knowing, Learning, and Instruction: Essays in Honor of Robert Glaser*, edited by Lauren B. Resnick, 25-46. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Knutson, Elizabeth M. 1993. Teaching Whole Texts: Literature and Foreign Language Reading Instruction. *French Review* 67: 12–26.

Koppensteiner, Jürgen. 1990. 'Das schriftstellernde Phänomen in der deutschsprachigen Jugendbuch-Szene': Ein Plädoyer für die Arbeit mit Texten von Christine Nöstlinger. *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 23: 106–11.

Lazar, Gillian. 1993. *Literature and Language Teaching: A Guide for Teachers and Trainers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Littlewood, William T. 1986. Literature in the School Foreign-Language Course. In *Literature and Language Teaching*, edited by Christopher J. Brumfit and Ronald Carter, 177–83. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, Michael H., and Graham Crookes. 1993. Units of Analysis in Syllabus Design. The Case of Task. In *Tasks in Pedagogical Context: Integrating Theory and Practice*, edited by Graham Crookes and Susan M. Gass, 9–56. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Long, Michael H., and Peter Robinson. 1998. Focus on Form: Theory, Research, and Practice. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams, 15–63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, James R. 1985. Process and Text: Two Aspects of Human Semiosis. In *Systemic Perspectives on Discourse*, edited by James D. Benson and William S. Greaves, 243–74. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

_____. 1998. Linguistics and the Consumer: The Practice of Theory. *Linguistics and Education* 9: 411–48.

_____. 1999. Mentoring Semogenesis: 'Genre-Based' Literacy Pedagogy. In *Pedagogy and the Shaping of Consciousness: Linguistic and Social Processes*, edited by Frances Christie, 123–55. London: Cassell.

Miller, Carolyn R. 1984. Genre as Social Action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70: 151–67.

Moeller, Aleidine J., and Christèle Kunczinam. 1993. *Der Richter und sein Henker*: A Model for the Teaching of Literature and Methodology for Teacher Educators and Teachers. *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 26: 148–61.

Moffit, Gisela. 1998. *Oya?*—O, ja! Reading *Jugendliteratur* in the German Classroom. *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 31: 116–24.

Mohan, Bernard A. 1979. Relating Language Teaching and Content Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 13: 171–82.

_____. 1986. *Language and Content*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

_____. 1987. The Structure of Situations and the Analysis of Text. In *Language Topics: Essays in Honour of Michael Halliday*, edited by Ross Steele and Terry Threadgold, 507–22. Vol. II. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

_____. 1989. Knowledge Structures and Academic Discourse. *Word* 40: 99–115.

Murti, Kamakshi P. 1996. Teaching Literature at the First-Year Graduate Level: The Quantum Leap from Language to Literature. In *Challenges of Literary Texts in the Foreign Language Classroom*, edited by Lothar Bredella and Werner Delanoy, 185–204. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The New London Group. 1996. A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures. *Harvard Educational Review* 66: 60–92.

Paltridge, Brian. 1995. Analyzing Genre: A Relational Perspective. *System* 23: 503–11.

Patrikis, Peter C. 1995. The Foreign Language Problem: The Governance of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. In *Redefining the Boundaries of Language Study*, edited by Claire Kramsch, 293–335. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Response to Dorothy James, 'Bypassing the Traditional Leadership: Who's Minding the Store?' Part 1. 1998. *ADFL Bulletin* 29(2): 39–76.

Response to Dorothy James, 'Bypassing the Traditional Leadership: Who's Minding the Store?' Part 2. 1998. *ADFL Bulletin* 29(3): 46–68.

Richards, Jack C. 1994. The Sources of Language Teachers' Instructional Decisions. In *Educational Linguistics, Crosscultural Communication, and Global Interdependence (Gurt '94)*, edited by James E. Alatis, 384–402. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Robinson, Peter. 2001.Task Complexity, Task Difficulty and Task Production: Exploring Interactions in a Componential Framework. *Applied Linguistics* 22: 27–57.

Ronke, Astrid. 1993. Theaterspielen als didaktisches Mittel im Fremdsprachenunterricht: Ergebnisse einer Umfrage an amerikanischen und kanadischen Universitäten und Colleges. *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 26: 211–19.

Schultz, Jean-Marie. 1996. The Uses of Poetry in the Foreign Language Curriculum. *French Review* 69: 920–32.

Skehan, Peter. 1998. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Slobin, Dan I. 1996a. From "Thought and Language" to "Thinking for Speaking." In *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*, edited by John J. Gumperz and Stephen C. Levinson, 70–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 1996b. Two Ways to Travel: Verbs of Motion in English and Spanish. In *Grammatical Constructions: Their Form and Meaning*, edited by Masayoshi Shibatani and Sandra A. Thompson, 195–219. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____. 1997. Mind, Code, and Text. In *Essays on Language Function and Language Type. Dedicated to T. Givón*, edited by Joan Bybee, John Haiman, and Sandra A. Thompson, 437–67. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

_____. 1998. Verbalized Events: A Dynamic Approach to Linguistic Relativity and Determinism. Unpublished MS.

Stoller, Fredricka L., and William Grabe. 1997. A Six-T's Approach to Content-Based Instruction. In *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspectives on*

Integrating Language and Content, edited by Marguerite Ann Snow and Donna M. Brinton, 78–94. White Plains: Longman.

Swaffar, Janet K., Katherine Arens, and Heidi Byrnes. 1991. *Reading for Meaning: An Integrated Approach to Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Swales, John M. 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Two volumes. Boston: MIT Press.

Tannen, Deborah. 1982. The Oral/Literate Continuum in Discourse. In *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*, edited by Deborah Tannen, 1–15. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

_____. 1992. How Is Conversation like Literary Discourse? The Role of Imagery and Details in Creating Involvement. In *The Linguistics of Literacy*, edited by Pamela Downing, Susan D. Lima, and Michael Noonan, 31–46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tomasello, Michael, ed. 2000. *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Vygotsky, Lev. 1986. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wells, Gordon. 1994. The Complementary Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky to a "Language-Based Theory of Learning." *Linguistics and Education* 6: 41–90.

_____. 2000. Dialogic Inquiry in Education: Building on the Legacy of Vygotsky. In *Vygotskian Perspectives on Literacy Research: Constructing Meaning Through Collaborative Inquiry*, edited by Carol D. Lee and Peter Smagorinsky, 51–85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, James V. 2000. Vygotsky's Two Minds on the Nature of Meaning. In *Vygotskian Perspectives on Literacy Research: Constructing Meaning Through Collaborative Inquiry*, edited by Carol D. Lee and Peter Smagorinsky, 19–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, James V., and Norris Minick. 1990. Negotiating Sense in the Zone of Proximal Development. In *Promoting Cognitive Growth over the Life Span*, edited by Milton Schwebel, Charles A. Maher, and Nancy S. Fagley, 71–87. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A

German 266
Look who's laughing: German Comedies
Fall 1998

Plays

Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, Minna von Barnhelm, 1767
Heinrich von Kleist, Der zerbrochne Krug, 1808
Carl Sternheim, Die Hose, 1911
Friedrich Dürrenmatt, Der Besuch der Alten Dame, 1955
Patrick Süskind, Der Kontrabaß, 1983

Prose Works

Heinrich Spoerl, Der Tiefstapler, 1921; Der gute Ton am Telefon, 1919
Ernst Heimeran, Der rätselhafte Huber, 1954

Cartoons

Wilhelm Busch, Max und Moritz, 1865

Films

Minna von Barnhelm, 1992
Der zerbrochne Krug (Emil Jannings version)
Der Besuch der Alten Dame (Elisabeth Flickenschildt version)
Doris Dörrie, Männer, 1985
Sketches by Loriot, 1970s and 1980s

Course

German comedies have often been considered a contradiction in terms: most readers, students, and indeed scholars consider German literature the most sinister, serious, and insidiously humorless of all world literatures. In this course, students will map this perception against a close reading of five German comedies, three short prose works and viewing of films and sketches. We will investigate different stylistic forms of "what's so funny," including irony, slapstick, sarcasm, ridicule, as well as recurring themes in comedy, including class-based "humor" and the gender wars. Short theoretical treatises by authors of comedies will help us determine how authors of comedies themselves have sought to differentiate their genre from other dramatic forms like tragedy or *Tragikomödie*, and when, how and why these distinctions have historically occurred.

Writing Assignments As a Level IV course, this course seeks to refine students' perception of literary style through close readings of selected scenes from each drama and analysis of different aspects of the scene (plot/plotting, construction of the scene, characterization, linguistic aspects). Students will be required to produce three papers of approximately five pages each, all in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

processed writing (outline, paper, re-write); each incorporating vocabulary and stylistic tools presented and practiced in class. Each paper sets a different task: one is an analysis of a scene or character; the second a review of a comedy performance, to be viewed during the semester; the third a short research paper on genre questions in connection with one of the plays discussed in the course.

Diskussionsleitung and Protokolle Students will be required to lead one class discussion in teams of two; for each of these discussions, another student will produce discussion minutes *(Protokoll)*. Guidelines for both *Diskussionsleitung and Protokoll* will be provided in class.

Referate Students will be required, in teams of two or three, to introduce one of the authors read in the course, with biography, his/her most important works, socio-historical background, and remarks on the author's significance for his/her genre. Research for these presentations is to be done collaboratively. The presentations will be held in German, based on notes.

Final Performance Project Each student is required to participate in the production and performance of one scene which will be performed at the end of the semester. Students will divide into working groups (one per scene); each working group is responsible for selecting the scene, distributing parts, and other jobs (such as acquiring the necessary costumes and props), learning and rehearsing lines, and directing the scene. Students will have the opportunity to view videotaped professional performances of two dramas on which they can "model" their own productions. All work connected with the performance, including organizational and instructional (director's instructions, etc.), must be done in German. The goal of these performances is to use German not only in the theoretical/academic, but also in the organizational context acquire a natural feeling for the diction and intonation of spoken German, and to perform the language in the linguistic as well as the theatrical sense.

Gratuitous Fun Occasionally, brief comedy sketches from German TV will be shown in class. These can be treated as listening comprehension exercises, if you're feeling serious, or as time off/time out/gratuitous fun.

Grade Breakdown

In-class Participation	15%	Diskussionsleitung/Protokoll	10%
First two Papers (15% each)	30%	Referat	10%
Third Paper	20%	Final Performance	15%

Weekly Syllabus

Woche 1 (3. September): Einführung in den Kurs
Woche 2–3 (8.–17. September): Minna von Barnhelm
Woche 4–5 (22. September–1. Oktober): Der zerbrochne Krug

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Hausarbeit 1 **1. Version: 22. September**
2. Version: 29. September

Woche 6 (6. und 8. Oktober): Max und Moritz
Woche 7–8 (13.–22. Oktober): Die Hose
Hausarbeit 2 **1. Version: 20. Oktober**
Woche 9 (27.–29. Oktober): Prose Works by Spoerl and Heimeran
Hausarbeit 2 **2. Version: 27. Oktober**
Woche 10-11 (3.–12. November): Der Besuch der alten Dame
Outline und Bibliographie für Hausarbeit 3: 10. November
Woche 13 (17.–19. November): Der Kontrabass
Hausarbeit 3 **1. Version: 19. November**
Woche 14 (24. November): Diskussion der Abschlussprojekte
Woche 15 (1.–3. Dezember): Männer & Abschlussdiskussion
Hausarbeit 3 **2. Version: 1. Dezember**
Woche 16 (8. Dezember): Aufführungen: Szenen

APPENDIX B (English)

Discussing a Test

I. General Statements

The text/the drama/the play concerns itself with the theme of
(love, money, sexual relations)

In this text, the playwright dramatizes (portrays) the following themes:
(love, money, sexual relations)

At the center of this comedy are . . .

The plot of the drama develops (unfolds) as follows:

II. Formal Analysis

The play is divided into (five acts, fourteen scenes)

Scenes change (when persons enter or exit the stage)

Scenes are sequenced as follows: . . .

The protagonist(s) / antagonist(s) are characterized as (+ noun)
are characterized as follows: (begin another sentence)

The historical (cultural) background of the drama refers to . . .
describes . . .

The play originated from the following sources: ...

In the play, the following
gestures
light effects
costumes
gestures
props etc.
are employed
emphasized
centered

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B (German)

Über einen Text sprechen

I. Allgemeine Aussagen

Der Text
Der Roman/die Kurzgeschichte
Das Drama befasst sich mit dem Thema ...(Geschlechterbeziehunge
Liebe, Geiz)

Die Komödie

In diesem Text (in dieser Geschichte) behandelt der Verfasser das Thema .

Der Verfasser dramatisiert in dieser Komödie das Thema ...

Bei diesem Text handelt es sich um ... (eine Liebeskomödie, eine Situatio
komödie, eine Kriminalgeschichte)

In seinem Text stellt der Autor (etwas) in den Mittelpunkt
betont der Autor die Rolle (+ Genitiv)

Der Inhalt der Kurzgeschichte/des Romans besteht aus ...
dreht sich um (+ Akk) ...

Die Handlung der Tragödie entwickelt sich wie folgt ...

II. Formelle Aussagen

Das Drama (die Komödie) ist unterteilt in fünf Akte
vierzehn Szenen

Personen treten auf/treten oder gehen ab (der Auftritt; der Abgang)

Szenen wechseln (beim Auftritt oder Abgang von Personen)

Der Szenenaufbau
Die Szenenabfolge entwickelt sich wie folgt

Die Hauptfigur(en) und Nebenfigur(en) wird wie folgt charakterisiert:

Die Hauptfigur wird charakterisiert als ein geiziger Mensch
ein unschuldiges Mädchen
ein bitterer alter Herr

Der historische (kulturelle) Hintergrund des Dramas
bezieht sich auf (+Akk) das Dritte Reich
beschreibt den Dreißigjährigen Krieg

Im Drama werden (wird) die (der, das) folgende(n)
Lichteffekte
Requisiten
Kostüme
Gestik
eingesetzt

angewandt
verwendet
zur Geltung gebracht
benutzt

APPENDIX C (English)

Countering Scholarly Arguments

The author erroneously states that . . .
This depiction is riddled with inconsistencies.
His conclusion is dubious.
This is not based on (rooted in) fact.
One should avoid such erroneous conclusions.
One could raise the following doubts/questions with regard to the author's conclusion:
The author's conclusion rests on a weak foundation.
This portrayal is based on a misunderstanding.
This opinion is attributed to someone.
It can be regarded as obvious/improbable that . . .
A possible compromise is offered by . . .

APPENDIX C (German)

Ein wissenschaftliches Argument widerlegen

Etwas irrtümlicherweise zum Faktum erheben
In dieser Darstellung bestehen faktische Widersprüche
Seine Schlussfolgerung ist zu bezweifeln/zweifelhaft/anzuzweifeln
Eine Aussage beruht auf einem Irrtum
Man sollte derartige Fehlschlüsse vermeiden
Gegen diesen Schluss sind Bedenken zu erheben/lassen sich Bedenken erheben
Diese Schlussfolgerung steht auf schmalem/wankendem Fundament
Seine Darstellung beruht auf einem Missverständnis
Diese Meinung wird jemandem zugeschrieben
Etwas kann als (un)wahrscheinlich/offensichtlich angesehen werden
Als (Kompromiss)Lösung bietet sich xxx an

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

Instructions for Oral Presentations

Materials

1. Please write *the outline* of your entire oral presentation on an overhead (no complete sentences, please). Except for this overhead, you should not take anything with you, that is: you must speak freely, based only on your notes on the overhead.
2. You should discuss your overhead with me the week before your presentation. Please hand in your overhead (hard copy) during the class period before your presentation. I will then correct it and return it to you the same afternoon.
3. You should also have a handout for the entire class, which follows the content of the outline on your overhead but is formulated in complete sentences. Please hand your handout in to me the class period before your presentation for my correction. It is very important that you do not distribute your handout until *the end* of your presentation. Otherwise, the class will read your handout instead of listening to you. The purpose of the handout is to enable the class to read it at home and have a permanent record of your presentation.
4. Please use other materials, such as video and audio-cassettes, www etc. *very sparingly.* You should consider carefully which pedagogical goals you have in mind by using these materials for your presentation, and how much time you wish to invest in them. Remember that you only have 20 minutes (as a group) and that most of this time must be given to you speaking freely, rather than fiddling with technology. If your author was also a painter (W. Busch), it would be appropriate to show some of his work to the class, either via handout or overhead.

II. Content

Your presentation should consist of four parts:

1. Biography and most important works
2. Literary, political or historical background of the play we have read (Lessing and the Enlightenment, Kleist and Romanticism, Sternheim and the Wilhelminian Age)
3. Significance of the *author particularly for his genre* (Lessing and comedy, Busch and cartoons, Dürrenmatt and tragicomedy/the grotesque)
4. Significance of the author in one other field (Lessing as religious philosopher, Busch as painter). This means that you have to research your presentation carefully. You can either research the entire presentation as a group or divide separate parts of it (political background, biography, etc.) among yourselves. **Do be certain that the final result is a coherent whole.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. Language
I expect that your presentation will utilize both the style and the expressions we have learned. Of particular relevance may be I (General Statements) and III (Authorial Positions).

IV. Grading
Your presentation will be graded according to the following categories:

1.	Extensiveness of research	25%
2.	Content	25%
3.	Free speech	25%
4.	Style/Complexity of speech	25%

All members of the group will receive the same grade in the first two categories; categories 3 and 4 will be individually graded. You should therefore, *as a group*, take great care that your research and the content of your presentation are of professional quality.

APPENDIX E

Heinrich Christian Wilhelm Busch (1832–1908)
(excerpt from a student's oral presentation, my translation)

I. Biography

1832:	Birth in Wiedensahl (near Hanover) Four brothers, one sister
1841:	Education through his uncle (Pastor Georg Kleine) Move to Ebergoetzen near Göttingen. Friendship with Erich Bachmann
1847:	16th birthday. Acceptance at Polytechnic University in Hanover—beginning of his study of mechanical engineering
1848:	Unhappiness with his studies of mechanical engineering; vague period of his life. Takes some courses in art.
1851:	Exmatriculation from the Polytechnic University in Hannover. Move to Düsseldorf. Immatriculation at the Academy of Art in Düsseldorf—Teacher Wilhelm von Schadow
1852:	Move to Antwerp; Student at the Academie Royale des Beaux-Arts
1853:	Severe illness (typhoid fever), return to Wiedensahl, beginning of his collection of fairy tales

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX F

Homework for Tuesday, October 13

Please write, in teams of 4–5, an adaptation of Kleist's drama *The Broken Jug:*

- In twentieth-century German
- Shortened to ten minutes
- In the style of the US-genre "courtroom drama." To do this, you may have to invent characters that do not exist in the original or leave out some that do.

You should take care to retain *all important* elements of the plot and characterizations. Your drama can be a satire or parody of the original.

PLEASE DO *NOT* QUOTE DIRECTLY FROM THE ORIGINAL: Your entire drama must be a paraphrase of the original.

PLEASE WORK TOGETHER AS A GROUP (do *NOT* divide the scenes up among yourselves and write portions of the play separately!).

You will perform your play on Tuesday, October 13, in class. Every member of your team must participate in the performance. You can take the script with you, in other words, you do not need to memorize the lines, but do act the play out and read with dramatic intonation.

Style: The relevance of our new style (cf. handout "Crime and Punishment") is obvious and can help you a great deal when writing your comedy.

Team 1: Hanne, Michelle, Jeremy, Frank
Team 2: Ivan, Ryo, Suzanne, Kirsten
Team 3: Fred, Vivien, Dan, Patrick, Cy

APPENDIX G (English)

Minna von Barnhelm, Excerpt
Written and Performed by Four Students
My translation, mistakes approximated

Dramatis Personae:
007— Major von Tellheim
Q—Just
008—Werner
Hotel Manager—innkeeper
Frenchman who works for M
Zhenia—Minna
Alota Fagina—Franziska
Widdow *[sp]* of an agents *[sp]*
Riccaut
Post[man]

Hotel in Paris.

007 Thanks for your services, but we today *[syntactical error]* will look for a new hotel.

Hotel manager. But no. You can have the room up on the fourth floor—with a view of the Eiffel-tower.

Q Yeah, probably with a view of the Eiffel-tower that is painted on the backside of the laundermat. *(Hotel manager exits.)*

Q I simply can't believe that he has thrown you, an agent *[ending error]*, out of his room. He would never have had the courage to do that if you were still working for the Queen of England.

007 Q, take this ring and pay the bill with it. I don't want to stay any longer in this pigstie *[sp]* than absolutely necessary.

Q That the *[gender error]* pig has admitted himself *[lexical error]* the insolence of insulting you like this. He expects of himself *[lexical error]* that you can't pay just because M has fired you.

007 Please don't remind me. Go after the hotel manager. (*Q exits.)*

Lady in mourning (knock, knock, knock). Does the cat sing at noon?

007 Only if it rains.

Lady 007, you don't know me. I am the widow of 009. I don't know if you know *[missing object]*, but he was shot last week by the Soviets in Monaco. In his will he said thaat *[sp]* he owes you a million dollars. Here is the account number of a Swiss account. You can find the money there.

007 You say, you are the wife of 009?

Lady *Da*, I mean, yes.

007 Does the singing girl wear a blue bow on Sundays?

Lady No, she wears her hair open.

007 My lady, please keep the money. Your husband paid me back a month ago. I'm terribly sorry about your husband. Use the money for your children's education.

Lady Oh, you are much too generous. Many thanks. *(Exits.)*

APPENDIX G (German)

Minna von Barnhelm, Auszug
Geschrieben und aufgeführt von 4 Studenten

Dramatis Personae:
007—Major von Tellheim
Q—Just
008—Werner
Hotel Manager—Wirt
Franzoser, der für M arbeitet
Zhenia—Minna
Alota Fagina—Franziska
Witwerin eines Agents
Riccaut
Post

Hotel in Paris.

007: Vielen Dank für Ihre Dienste, aber wir suchen ein neues Hotel heute.

Hotel-manager: Aber nein. Sie könnten das Zimmer oben in der 4. Etage haben—mit Blick auf den Eifelturm.

Q: Ja, wahrscheinlich mit Blick auf den angemalten Eifeltum, der auf der Rückseite der Münzwäscherei steht.

(Hotel-manager geht ab.)

Q: Ich kann es einfach nicht begreifen, dass er dich—einen Agent aus seinem Zimmer rausgeworfen hat. Er hätte niemals den Mut gehabt, das zu tun, wärst du noch bei der Königin von England.

007: Q, nimm diesen Ring und bezahl damit die Rechnung. Ich will in diesem Schweinestahl nicht länger bleiben, als es unbedingt sein muss.

Q: Dass der Schwein sich die Unverschämtheit zugelassen hat, dich so zu beleidigen. Er lasst sich zumuten, dass du nicht bezahlen kannst, nur weil M dich entlassen hat.

007: Bitte erinnere mich nicht daran. Geh dem Hotel-manager nach.

(Q geht ab.)

Dame in Trauer *(klopf, klopf, klopf):* Singt die Katze um Mittag?

007: Nur wenn es regnet.

Dame: 007, Sie kennen mich nicht. Ich bin die Witwe von 009. Ich weiß nicht, ob Sie wissen, aber er wurde letzte Woche von den Sowjeten in Monaco erschossen. In seinem Testament stand, daß er Ihnen eine Million Dollar schuldet. Hier ist

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").